

Supplement B: Categorization of included studies

Author (Year), Country	Categorization	Reason for inadequate/moderate categorization	Risk of bias	Checklists used
Biagioli et al. (2016), Italy	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Biagioli et al. (2017), Italy	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Day, Morgan et al. (2011), USA	moderate	Inclusion and exclusion criteria were not described	Selection	Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies
Day, Perencevich et al. (2011), USA	inadequate	Unclear whether or not participants showed symptoms/outcomes at baseline or developed them during study process	Selection	Checklist for Cohort Studies
Findik et al. (2012), Turkey	inadequate	No group similarities were calculated, no control group with non-isolated was present, the difference in treatment is discordant, there was only one survey time point, and data analysis is not allowed	Selection, measurement, performance	Checklist for Quasi- Experimental Studies
Goldsack et al. (2014), USA	inadequate	Survey method inappropriate, anchor examples unclear, no information on ethical standards	Credibility, dependability	Checklist for Qualitative Research
Guilley- Lerondeau et al. (2016), France	moderate	Unclear whether participants have outcomes of interest at baseline, no strategies to deal with incomplete follow up	Attrition, selection	Checklist for Cohort Studies
Hao et al. (2020), Singapur/China	adequate			Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies
	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Hereng et al. (2019), France	inadequate	Data collection and data analysis inappropriate to the research question	Credibility, dependability	Checklist for Qualitative Research

Hu et al. (2020), China	adequate			Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies
Ibert et al. (2017), Germany	inadequate	Insufficient information on inclusion criteria, statistical analyses inappropriate	Selection, measurement	Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies
Jesus et al. (2019), Brazil	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Livorsi et al. (2015), USA	adequate			Checklist for Case Control Studies
Lupión- Mendoza et al. (2015), Spain	moderate	Influence of researchers on research unclear, no explicit philosophical perspective, anchor examples insufficient, no information on theoretical background available	Credibility, confirmability	Checklist for Qualitative Research
	adequate			Checklist for Case Control Studies
Pei et al. (2021), China	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Russell et al. (2011), UK	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Shaban et al. (2020), Australia	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Siddiqui et al. (2019), USA	adequate			Checklist for Case Control Studies
Son et al. (2021), Korea	adequate			Checklist for Qualitative Research
Vinski et al. (2012), USA	moderate	Outcomes were measured with HCAHPS, which according to Westbrook et al. (2014), is not reliable or valid, no strategy was described and used with confounders identified	Measurement	Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies